

quadriplegic could walk, so that someone who has Alzheimer's. We have heard Nancy Reagan speak directly about the stem cell research, I think a woman who is universally loved everywhere in this country and her husband whom I think is universally loved as well.

This chart remains up here. I have put it up here, because the numbers are 24 million. For diabetes, 15 million people, not just numbers; 6 million Alzheimer's, 1 million Parkinson's. People. People. People. Individuals.

Again, I ask my colleagues, this should not be a difficult issue. We should reject the bill and approve the substitute.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

(Mr. BUYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the substitute and in support of the gentleman from Florida's Human Cloning Prohibition Act.

Members in opposition are using the substitute amendment and are trying to confuse the issue with medical research and stem cell research. The underlying bill bans cloning human beings. It is straightforward and narrowly drawn. It prohibits somatic cell nucleus transfer. The underlying bill does nothing to hinder medical research and in fact, it specifically permits technology to clone tissue, DNA, and non-embryonic cells in humans, and cloning of plants and animals.

I urge my colleagues not to confuse a straightforward ban on banning cloning of human beings, with medical research. H.R. 2505 would prohibit human cloned embryos from being used as human guinea pigs. Without this legislation, human life could be copied, manufactured in a laboratory, in a petri dish. Cloned embryos would be devoid of all sense of humanity, treated as objects. The mass production of human clones solely for the purpose of human experimentation degrades us all.

The simple, most effective, way to stop this process is to ban it. In the area of human embryo cloning, the end does not justify the means.

I urge the defeat of the substitute and the adoption of H.R. 2505.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, late last week Washington Post columnist Charles Krauthammer called Congressman GREENWOOD's legislative approach to human cloning "a nightmare of a bill." He went on to write that the Greenwood substitute "sanctions, licenses and protects the launching of the most ghoulish and dangerous enterprise in modern scientific history: the creation of nascent cloned human life for the sole purpose of its exploitation and destruction."

Charles Krauthammer, Mr. Speaker, nailed it precisely.

The Greenwood substitute would for the first time in history sanction the creation of human life with the demand, backed by new Federal criminal and civil sanctions, that the new life be destroyed after it is experimented upon and exploited. For the small inconvenience of registering your name and your business address, you would be licensed to play God by creating life in your own image or someone else's. You would have the right to create embryo farms, headless human clones, or anything else science might one day allow to be created outside the womb; and in the end only failure to kill what you had created would be against the law.

A few moments ago, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) said that cloning doesn't result in the creation of a unique human being. That's ludicrous. That is exactly what the Weldon bill speaks to. That unique human being that would be created if left unfettered and untouched would grow, given nourishment and nurturing, into a baby, a toddler into an adolescent adulthood and right through the continuum of life. That is what we are talking about. Mr. WELDON's bill doesn't preclude other potentially legislative processes.

Mr. Speaker, amazingly the only new crime created by the Greenwood amendment is the failure to kill all human lives once they are created. Federal law would say that it is permissible to create as many human lives as you want to for research just so long as you eventually kill them. That, my colleagues, is the stated intent of the Greenwood substitute. And Mr. Greenwood's substitute would not even stop the birth of a human clone, which it purports to do. Because his approach would encourage the creation of cloned human embryo stockpiles and cloned human embryo farms, it would make the hard part of human cloning completely legal and try to make the relatively easy part, implantation, illegal.

So once these cloned human embryos are stockpiled in a lab, Mr. Speaker, who, or what is going to stop somebody from implanting one of those cloned humans? The Greenwood substitute has no tracking provisions. Greenwood would open Pandora's box and verification would be a joke.

The bottom line is this, Mr. Speaker, the Greenwood substitute permits the cloning of human life to do anything you would like to for research purposes just as long as you kill that human life. Mr. Speaker, to implement this debate some Members have taken to the well to say that everybody is against human cloning. Oh really? Just because we say it's so doesn't make it necessarily so. The simple—and sad—fact of the matter is that Greenwood is pro-cloning. The Weldon bill, the underlying bill, would end human cloning and would prescribe certain criminal as well as civil penalties for those who commit that offense.

We are really at a crossroads, Mr. Speaker. This is a major ethical issue. And make no mistake about it I want to find cures to the devastating disease that afflicts people. I am cochairman of the Alzheimer's Caucus. I am co-chairman of the Autism Caucus. I chair the Veterans Committee and have just today gotten legislation passed to help Gulf War Vets. I believe desperately we have got to find cures. But creating human embryos for research purposes is unethical, it is wrong, and it ought to be made illegal.

I hope Members will support the Weldon bill and will vote "no" on the substitute when it is offered.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2505, the Human Cloning Prohibition Act and in support of the Greenwood-Deutsch substitute.

I am absolutely opposed to reproductive human cloning. Reproductive human cloning is morally wrong and fundamentally opposed to the values held by our society. I am sure that every Member in this chamber today agree, that reproductive human cloning should be banned. That conclusion is easy to come by Mr. Speaker, however, this debate, unfortunately, is not so simple.

Today we are considering a complex issue, and I share the concerns raised by several other Members that the House is rushing to judgment. We have had too little time to debate and consider the merits and implications that Mr. WELDON's bill and Mr. GREENWOOD's substitute present. The Weldon bill and the Greenwood Substitute ban reproductive human cloning and both set criminal penalties for those who violate such a ban. But the similarities end there. Mr. WELDON's bill goes too far, including banning therapeutic cloning for research or medical treatment, while the Greenwood substitute allows an exception regarding therapeutic cloning. The Weldon bill would ban all forms of cloning, and in essence, stop all research associated with it, just as we are beginning to see the first fruits of biomedical research. By supporting the Greenwood alternative, we have the opportunity to ban reproductive cloning while allowing important research to continue.

As a member of the Science Committee and as a Representative from the Research Triangle Park region, I understand the importance of the research that our scientists are conducting. This research has the potential to save the lives of hundreds of thousands of North Carolinians, Americans, and people throughout the globe who suffer from debilitating and degenerative diseases. We are on the verge of a significant return on our biomedical research investment. Indeed, our scientists may one day solve the mysteries of disease as the result of work involving therapeutic cloning technology. We must not allow this opportunity to pass by us.

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear, I support banning reproductive human cloning, and I will continue to oppose any type of cloning that would attempt to intentionally create a human clone. However, I also support the important biomedical research that our nation's scientists are nobly conducting today. I cannot support a bill that denies those scientists, and the people whose lives they are working to improve, a chance to find a cure.